

Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR

From: Boz Boschen <boz.boschen@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:43 AM
To: PDR Land Use Admin; Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR
Cc: artrierites@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: 3301-3 Park

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Please see feedback below from an impacted neighbor regarding this pending SUP review.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <artrierites@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Nov 4, 2022 at 10:49 AM
Subject: RE: 3301-3 Park
To: <Andreas.Addison@rva.gov>, Brown, Whitney H. - City Council Office <Whitney.Brown@rva.gov>, , <mdazoning@museumdistrict.org>, Museum District Association <mdapresident@museumdistrict.org>
Cc: Boz Boschen <boz.boschen@gmail.com>

From: artrierites@gmail.com <artrierites@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 9:57 AM
To: 'Boz Boschen' <boz.boschen@gmail.com>
Subject: 3301-3 Park

Dear Folks;

Looking at the plans, it doesn't look like applicant has adjusted his previous alley setbacks, I am still concerned about getting our vehicles in and out of our garage with his proposed setback. Our garage door is opposite 3303 Park in the alley. I do not wish to give up my off street parking for the applicants' off street parking. Certainly Every property on the block adheres to the existing alley setback, so should applicant

Arthur Cassanos

3302 Patterson Ave

Richmond, Va

--

Boz Boschen

President | American Marketing Association, Richmond

[Explore our events and get involved](#)

Founder | Opsi Marketing & Advertising Advisory

Mobile: (804) 396-0747, [Join my network](#)

From: [Taylor Rule](#)
To: [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR](#)
Subject: 3301-3303 Park Avenue Development
Date: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 12:12:42 AM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Hello everyone,

I'd like to express my support for the proposed project on 3301-3303 Park Avenue (ORD. 2022-232). I usually find it fruitless to write in support of individual projects, but I was incredibly disheartened reading the negative comments on the building and wanted to provide some perspective ahead of the meeting next week. Reading these opposition letters, you would think there is nothing more important than "neighborhood character", stepbacks, and massing. I'd like to tell you some of the things that I think are important:

- **Carbon emissions** - The latest IPCC report is unambiguous in its finding that dense development is the most effective tool that cities have to reduce carbon emissions. Multifamily houses consume less energy thanks to the lower heating requirements of shared walls, and newly constructed buildings have better envelopes than old ones. The Museum District also has a walk score of 89 with a bike score of 80, which reduces the number of car trips - the average new development in Richmond is [less walkable than the existing housing stock](#) thanks in large part to the difficulty of building in neighborhoods like the Museum District. Whenever you decline proposals like the one in question, you get more unsustainable development like [this](#). How much extra carbon should we emit in the name of keeping buildings the same height? Recall that City Council has declared a climate state of emergency in Richmond.
- **Affordability** - Increasing the housing supply improves affordability. This is one of the straightforward cases where economic theory lines up with the [empirical work](#).
- **People will get to live in the building** - For some reason this often goes overlooked so it's worth repeating: these four units will be somebody's home. If you do some research online about the best places to live in Richmond, the Museum District consistently ranks near the top. Yet the population in the neighborhood has remained constant in the past ten years even as the city proper added 20,000 new people. The Museum District is a great neighborhood, the City should allow more people to live in it.
- **Property rights** - The developer owns the house and should be able to do what he wants with it, even if some neighbors submit melodramatic complaints about the aesthetics. One day I might even want to do what I want with my own property, and I'm sure I will resent going through this farcical process.

I think any one of the above reasons to approve the housing is an order of magnitude more important than the opposition's squabbles about existing scale or brick color or "composition". Also, it is ridiculous to cite the existing zoning code as a reason to oppose the proposed development, as zones R-1 through R-6 all require a minimum lot width of 50 feet. That

zoning code would prohibit the construction of every single existing house in the Fan and Museum District, along with any structure at all: the lots are 20-30 feet wide. The front and side yard requirements are just as bad. A zoning code that makes multiple entire 130 year old neighborhoods illegal should be thrown in the garbage and I do not begrudge anyone for seeking a Special Use Permit to exempt themselves from it. I understand the City is in the process of rewriting these codes now anyway.

There are also a large number of multifamily houses all over the neighborhood, including fourplexes and sixplexes on Park Avenue. The 3303 lot has sat empty, and the 3301 house decrepit, since at least 2007 (the furthest back that Google Maps has pictures). Where were the neighbors' concerns about character and uniformity then? They could have bought the property and built a house there at any time in the last 15 years, instead they choose to complain when somebody actually does try to improve the neighborhood. I would encourage anybody who is scared of a three-story fourplex to please move to Henrico and leave the cities to people who actually like living in them.

In summary, I encourage you to approve the project as is without further delays or changes. I cannot begin to describe the embarrassment I felt when reading the opposition letters, in which my neighbors revealed themselves to be misanthropes who heckle their councilmen multiple times, often with their professional designations attached, all in order to prevent the construction of missing middle housing in a housing shortage. I would love to see you not only sign off on this building, but also re-write our outmoded zoning laws so that this type of person no longer has veto powers over new housing projects.

Regards,
Taylor Rule
Owner of 2222 Floyd Avenue

From: [Dave Daley](#)
To: lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; bpinnock@baskervill.com; murthyvg@gmail.com; [PDR Land Use Admin](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR](#); [Brown, Whitney H. - City Council Office](#); [Jordan, Katherine - City Council](#); [Philipsen, Sven J. - City Council](#); [Lambert, Ann-Frances - City Council](#); [Stokes, Kiya A. - City Council](#); [Nye, Kristen M. - City Council](#); [Siverd, Jr, Timothy M. - City Council](#); [Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office](#); [Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office](#); [Robertson, Ellen F. - City Council](#); [Floyd, Tavares M. - City Council](#); Rodney@thewiltoncom.com; [Newbille, Cynthia I. - City Council](#); [Patterson, Samuel - City Council Office](#); [Trammell, Reva M. - City Council](#); [Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office](#); [Jones, Michael J. - City Council](#); [McLane, Myquael D. City Council Office](#)
Subject: Final Review SUP 3301-3303 Park Avenue
Date: Monday, November 7, 2022 7:33:12 AM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I am again writing in opposition to the proposed development at 3301 Park Avenue, in which the developer, having misled everyone about his true intent when originally purchasing the property, proposes to demolish the single family house now located there and construct a monstrosity of four out-of-proportion and out of compliance townhouses. This project will not improve the community or the Museum District and will, if allowed, lead to the continued destruction of the homes and buildings in the District that make it a unique and desirable area of Richmond.

As noted in the City's own planning Staff Report, the proposed development "among other things, does not meet the requirements of sections 30-412.4(2)a, 30-412.4(2)b, 30-412.5(2)a, 30-412.5(2)b, 30-412.5(2)c, 30-412.6, and 30-412.7, regarding density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, and driveways, respectively, of the Code of the City of Richmond (2020), as amended. " At this point, why is the City even considering allowing a project with so many non-compliant aspects?

One of the characteristics of this area is that all of the homes along this and nearby streets is the front yard, rear yard, setbacks, and lot coverage. This project would change the character of the neighborhood, creating a block of single family residential buildings that is so different from all others so as to lessen the attractiveness of the area, and eliminating the character of our neighborhood.

The city cannot continue to permit the demolition of structures such as this just to cram in an unsuitable replacement. If the demolition is permitted, then this process will continue. Developers will start buying properties in the District for the purpose of demolishing them and constructing higher-density developments without regard to the character of the neighborhood being destroyed.

The proposed development does not meet City zoning standards. It does not comply with the West of the Boulevard Design Overlay District Design Guidelines. It destroys some of our classic housing stock. It creates traffic problems with an additional curb cut, it is not welcomed by the neighbors, it is bad for Richmond.

Please do the right thing for Richmond and reject this project.

Dave and Kathleen Daley
3225 W Franklin ST

Rodney@thewiltonco.com

lawmanchem@yahoo.com

jack@tredegarconstruction.com

Lincoln.Saunders@rva.gov

Andreas.Addison@rva.gov

egreenfield@hbar.org

max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com

bpinnock@baskervill.com

murthyvg@gmail.com

PDRLandUseAdmin@rva.gov

Alex.Dandridge@rva.gov

Robert.OliverIII@rva.gov

Alyson.Oliver@rva.gov

kevin.vonck@richmondgov.com

Maritza.Pechin@richmondgov.com

Reginald.Gordon@rva.gov

matthew.ebinger@richmondgov.com;

Raymond.Roakes@rva.gov

Whitney.Brown@rva.gov

katherine.jordan@richmondgov.com

sven.philipsen@richmondgov.com

ann-frances.lambert@richmondgov.com

kiya.stokes@richmondgov.com

kristen.larson@richmondgov.com

Timothy.SiverdJr@rva.gov

stephanie.lynch@richmondgov.com

amy.robins@richmondgov.com

Ellen.Robertson@Richmondgov.com

tavares.floyd@richmondgov.com

Cynthia.Newbille@Richmondgov.com

Sam.Patterson@Richmondgov.com

Reva.Trammell@Richmondgov.com

richard.bishop@richmondgov.com

michael.jones@richmondgov.com

myquael.mclane2@rva.gov

From: [Art Seidenberg](#)
To: rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; bpinnock@baskervill.com; murthyvg@gmail.com; [PDR Land Use Admin](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR](#)
Cc: [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [Brown, Whitney H. - City Council Office](#); [Jordan, Katherine - City Council](#); [Philipsen, Sven J. - City Council](#); ann-francis.lambert@richmondgov.com; [Stokes, Kiya A. - City Council](#); [Siverd, Jr, Timothy M. - City Council](#); [Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office](#); [Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office](#); [Robertson, Ellen F. - City Council](#); [Floyd, Tavares M. - City Council](#); [Newbille, Cynthia I. - City Council](#); [Patterson, Samuel - City Council Office](#); [Trammell, Reva M. - City Council](#); [Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office](#); [Jones, Michael J. - City Council](#); [McLane, Myquael D. City Council Office](#)
Subject: Issues Against the Proposed Development of 3301-3301 Park Avenue
Date: Sunday, November 6, 2022 6:18:39 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Good evening,

These are the concerns of Art Seidenberg, Retired VCU Professor and Administrator, and Resident of 3300 Patterson Avenue for 35 years.

I plan to read these remarks to the Planning Commission, tomorrow, on November 7, 2022.

My concerns are about safety, the developer, and aesthetics.

SAFETY:

This issue was brought to my attention by a neighbor of mine. She has a young child.

In looking over the plans, there is a driveway to Tilden Street that 5 cars will share. But, there is a solid wall on one side and a porch on the other side of the exit from these garages. The wall goes right up to the sidewalk (I will be giving a handout that shows this). On exiting, for a driver to see pedestrians, kids on bikes, dog walkers, they'll have to pull out almost to the curb. This, I think, is dangerous. This little "intersection" is just waiting for an accident to happen!

DEVELOPER:

I thought I heard about some concern for the developer's project. If a developer makes an investment in a property and needs exemptions to make it "work," that's their problem.....not ours. That is, work within the guidelines (ALL of them) and make a profit. Not work within the guidelines....chalk it off to a bad business decision.

At the last meeting, there was some talk, a comparison I believe, about this property (single family dwellings) and buildings at the other end of the block on Roseneath Road, which are apartment houses. No sense comparing apples to oranges.

I'm not sure if this is given any consideration or not, but the developer may have told you (he told us

at a meeting) that he plans to sell these 4 units for \$1.2 Million each. If I were with the city, I might get really excited at that significant dollar amount, that is, potential real estate tax revenue. This developer is a “dreamer.” He is reaching for the stars. These properties are NOT on Monument Avenue. They are four “squished” in buildings, with no yard, an alley that runs completely behind one, which has 20-30 daily cars coming in and out, along with garbage trucks and recycle trucks.

AESTHETICS:

I’m sure it’s something that architects take into consideration when beginning a project. All of us, when out walking a neighborhood (that’s what you do in the city with sidewalks) will say something like, “I like that house a lot” or “this house is not among my favorites.” We have a sense of what is pleasing to our eyes.

Let’s say I design a house for this property, and it meets all the guidelines, i.e., doesn’t require any exemptions. But, it looks just like a Japanese Pagoda (if that doesn’t conjure up some image, just google a picture of it). Would you approve that design for the Museum District? I think not.

It doesn’t fit Park Avenue and most likely won’t fit anywhere in the Museum District. Well, these 4 townhouses may not look like a Japanese Pagoda, but they don’t fit the block. Or, the surrounding blocks. “Fit” is the key and operative word here. Maybe somewhere else in the Museum District, but not at 3301/3303 Park Avenue. For this location, these 4 townhouses are unattractive, unpleasant, and objectionable. They are the Pagodas of Park Avenue.

Thank you for listening to me/reading this. I encourage you to deny the proposal to develop this property into four three-story buildings.

Art Seidenberg

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Rebecca Hollingsworth](mailto:Rebecca.Hollingsworth@pattersonavenue.com)
To: Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; bpinnock@baskervill.com; murthyvg@gmail.com; Admin@rva.gov; [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR](#); [Brown, Whitney H. - City Council Office](#); [Jordan, Katherine - City Council](#); [Philipsen, Sven J. - City Council](#); [Lambert, Ann-Frances - City Council](#); [Stokes, Kiya A. - City Council](#); [Nye, Kristen M. - City Council](#); [Siverd, Jr, Timothy M. - City Council](#); [Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office](#); [Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office](#); [Robertson, Ellen F. - City Council](#); [Floyd, Tavares M. - City Council](#); [Newbille, Cynthia I. - City Council](#); [Patterson, Samuel - City Council Office](#); [Trammell, Reva M. - City Council](#); [Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office](#); [Jones, Michael J. - City Council](#); [McLane, Myquael D. - City Council Office](#)
Subject: SUP Park Avenue 3301-3303
Date: Sunday, November 6, 2022 3:00:24 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear all,

I wanted to voice my concerns with the suggested development on the lot of 3301-3303 Park Avenue. The developers have changed designs several times but still haven't addressed the height of the building. A 3 story building has no precedent in the neighborhood despite them bringing forward the Roseneath Ave Apartment complex. For one this is built next to a Middle school on a direct through route and not a neighborhood corner. The school makes this a main artery and higher Apartment Buildings are just on streets that directly face the school. In addition is the building adorned with intricate woodwork and beautiful historic pillars which make it an historical part of that block. The suggested Houses have no such, nowadays deemed unnecessary and cost adding design elements which would make it possibly part of the historic look of the neighborhood. They have compared two very different buildings and locations here. It is a historic district and new development should honor this. The density of the proposed houses is unlike any in the neighborhood as well. This is a family neighborhood with yards for children to play in. The proposed designs will use up every square inch of available space and will not be in line with the other types of houses in this area. The unnecessary and to early removal of a majestic neighborhood Oak tree before the proposal was approved just shows how little regard they have for the due process and how they think they can get away with it without being held to the established standards. A third and very real concern is for safety. The large housing blocks with an added inlet for garages will be a safety concern for pedestrians. The buildings will be massive Brick facades that reach almost to the sidewalk and in such are a sight block for any leaving cars. Any car leaving the inlet would need to pull fully onto the sidewalk in order to see the traffic situation and by then the running toddler, child on a bike or dog on its leash will already be potentially hit by a car. Again this is a family neighborhood with a high walking score and the proposed design seemed to have completely disregarded the safety of the pedestrians. I can not grow flowers that are over 2' high on the corners of the grass strips between the street and sidewalk because it would obstruct the view but a 3 story brick wall right next to the pedestrian sidewalk is ok? I think not. I am not against development and see the need of affordable housing but looking at the plans this proposal doesn't fall in the affordable category.... I am from Germany where we value our historic districts which are the soul of Towns and which pull many American tourists every year and now here, with the Museum district and Fan you have such a gem yourself so please don't sell it out to developers under the false advertisement of affordable housing. Have them build an addition on the existing House and renovate it and build a second house on the empty lot. If they bought it and their numbers aren't adding up if they don't build 4 Units then this was a wrong business decision on their part and can not mean rules should be bent to make their wrong investment work for them while disregarding the wishes of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hollingsworth (Patterson Avenue neighbor)

From: [Ephraim Seidman](#)
To: Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; [Mr. Jack Thompson](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield](#); [Mr. Max Hepp-Buchanan](#); [Mr. Burt Pinnock](#); [Mr. Vik Murthy](#); [PDR Land Use Admin](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR](#); [Brown, Whitney H. - City Council Office](#); [Jordan, Katherine - City Council](#); [Philipsen, Sven J. - City Council](#); [Lambert, Ann-Frances - City Council](#); [Stokes, Kiya A. - City Council](#); [Nye, Kristen M. - City Council Office](#); [Siverd, Jr, Timothy M. - City Council](#); [Lynch, Stephanie A. - City Council Office](#); [Robins, Amy E. - City Council Office](#); [Robertson, Ellen F. - City Council](#); [Floyd, Tavares M. - City Council](#); [Newbille, Cynthia I. - City Council](#); [Patterson, Samuel - City Council Office](#); [Trammell, Reva M. - City Council](#); [Bishop, Richard K. - City Council Office](#); [Jones, Michael J. - City Council](#); [McLane, Myquael D. City Council Office](#)
Subject: Do Not Approve the SUP for 3301/3303 Park Avenue
Date: Sunday, November 6, 2022 2:59:33 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear City Planning Commission members and other interested parties,

I am again writing to you to express my opposition to the proposed project at 3301/3303 Park Avenue.

I have seen the updated plans and with that I now understand that the Department of Planning & Development has to my chagrin approved this project.

So why exactly is a SPECIAL USE PERMIT still needed to proceed with this project? It is in the name itself - **SPECIAL**. In other words **not** normal, or outside accepted guidelines. All because the builder, even with all the changes made to the plans, still does **NOT** meet guidelines set down by the City of Richmond in regards to density, lot area, front yards, side yards, rear yards, lot coverage, and driveways.

I am not against new development. I'm not against new construction. But I am against the destruction of this unique and aesthetically pleasing building at 3301 Park. I have already once sent a picture of the beautiful brickwork that was used in the construction of this house. I have enclosed it again.

If the developer does not think he can make any money by renovating (actually likely gutting) the existing house and building a new house (of course appropriate to the neighborhood) on the empty lot that is his problem, not the City's. And it is surely not my problem as a nearby resident. Enough houses in the MDA have been renovated/gutted and sold at a profit to disprove his excuse.

It has also come to my attention that it is very likely my personal property taxes will rise due to the (exorbitant?) prices being asked by the developer. Which of you are willing to pay the additional taxes residents in this neighborhood may likely have to fork over if this project gets approved? You are essentially leaving us with a bill to pay for this project if it is approved.

I see there are now balconies in the new plans. I sure wouldn't want to be a neighbor next to this building and have someone looking into my house from these balconies.

Nearly 100% of the neighbors and people that live in the vicinity of this property are

AGAINST this project. I would hope that means something to you as representatives of the citizens of the City of Richmond.

Thank you for reading my e-mail and I hope you will not approve this project.

Regards,

ER Seidman

eseidman1@gmail.com

804.334.2224

From: [Alex Henson](#)
To: Rodney@thewiltonco.com; lawmanchem@yahoo.com; jack@tredegarconstruction.com; [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); egreenfield@hbar.org; max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com; bpinnock@baskervill.com; murthyvg@gmail.com
Cc: [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver III, Robert W. - Temp Intern](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Liza Teodoro](#)
Subject: Re: 3301 and 3303 Park Ave. Special Use Permit
Date: Saturday, November 5, 2022 12:26:19 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission Members,

We write a third time to express our opposition to the proposed development at 3301 and 3303 Park Ave. While the developer continues to make some aesthetic changes, the bottom line is that it's still a tall, dense cluster of luxury housing that deviates from the standards of the neighborhood. But what we are most concerned about is the precedent being set. This kind of development opens the door to turning our beautiful city neighborhood into a luxury townhome and condo neighborhood.

When we lived in Chicago, we watched as historic neighborhoods with a diverse population succumbed to overdevelopment. Developers bought houses, usually from older residents who needed to sell due to changing circumstances or to get relief from the increasing property taxes due to development, and then turned them into three and 4 unit condo buildings. And then the infrastructure of the neighborhood wasn't sufficient and all of the revenue generated from the increased taxes went to address those issues. There were no substantial improvements in schools or many of the other benefits one would expect. These became nice neighborhoods for young professionals to live in until they moved to the suburbs and sold their condos to other young professionals. There is plenty of multi-unit development going on in Scott's Addition, and we believe that to be more than sufficient for what Richmond needs with way less impact on current homeowners.

We urge you to reject this proposal in favor of development that conforms to the design overlay and does not set precedents that will encourage further similar development at the expense of our wonderful neighbors and neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Alex Henson & Liza Teodoro
3221 Park Ave

From: [Steven Saltzberg](#)
To: [Rodney@thewiltonco.com](#); [lawmanchem@yahoo.com](#); [jack@tredegarconstruction.com](#); [Saunders, Lincoln - CAO](#); [Addison, Andreas D. - City Council](#); [egreenfield@hbar.org](#); [max.hepp.buchanan@gmail.com](#); [bpinnock@baskervill.com](#); [murthyvg@gmail.com](#)
Cc: [PDR Land Use Admin](#); [Dandridge, Alex - PDR](#); [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#); [Vonck, Kevin J. - PDR](#); [Pechin, Maritza - PDR](#); [Gordon, Reginald E. - Human Services](#); [Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#); [Roakes, Raymond A. - PDR](#); [boz.boschen@gmail.com](#)
Subject: In opposition to SUP for 3301/3303 Park Ave
Date: Saturday, November 5, 2022 11:05:35 AM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Planning Commission:

The Museum District, where I live, is a unique space within Richmond. Each area, each block, has its own uniqueness and character. The location is currently for single family residential, as is essentially the rest of the 3300 block of Park Avenue. The SUP for the Museum District (aka West of the Boulevard Historic District) challenges the regulations of the West of the Boulevard Overlay District and would change the very nature of that block– despite making revisions to try to make the construction palatable.

There is no reason to make the Museum District into a bunch of three-story apartment buildings – which is apparently what the more recent SUPs are proposing. Yes, our neighborhood is crowded with mostly one family residential dwellings, and the almighty dollar is providing incentives for developers to come in and create more units, via apartment building type structures. Do not allow that in our precious historical area.

Thank you,
Steven Saltzberg

--

Steve Saltzberg
804-306-5184 Mobile

"Don't vote with just your ballot, vote with your life"

From: [Bunny Wilks](#)
Subject: Regarding SUP @ 3301/3303 Park Avenue
Date: Sunday, November 6, 2022 10:58:27 AM

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

Dear Honorable Members of the Planning Commission, City Council Members and Relevant City Employees,

My name is Bunny Wilks and my husband and I have lived in the Museum District since 1995. We live right around the corner from 3301 Park Avenue.

I have voiced my opposition before to this development of 3301/3303 Park Avenue but feel certain points need to be reiterated:

After attending and listening to these meetings, it has become quite evident that this developer continues to make minute changes, however the SUP **STILL** does not meet the West of the Boulevard design overlay guidelines nor does it meet the goals of Richmond 300, mainly Historic Preservation, Urban Design and Planning Engagement.

And the latest change he made keeps the overall height of the buildings well above the allowances, with the intent of the guidelines being for a two-story single-family. Also, his latest revision **brings back** a design element that was eliminated in the first round: balconies on the sides of the buildings. A precedent we don't want in our neighborhood or elsewhere in the Museum District.

The neighbors as you can imagine are vehemently opposed to this SUP. Furthermore, it is these exact neighbors who will ultimately be penalized with higher real estate taxes as there is nothing else available at this price range (\$1.2 million per unit) in the neighborhood.

Please place yourself in the shoes of these neighbors.

And I've said it before, the solution is simple: renovate the current home at 3301 Park Avenue (simply gutting and removing the asbestos would cost the same as knocking down the home) and build a second home next door that is in keeping with the West of the Boulevard design guidelines and supports the goals of Richmond 300.

If this type of development continues in our neighborhood, the Museum District will no longer be the special place it has been for the last 100+ years.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter that affects the entire historic Museum District.

B. Wilks